

**WILLIAMSBURG
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
Tuesday, February 22, 2005**

CALL TO ORDER AND ATTENDANCE

The regular semimonthly Architectural Review Board meeting was held on Tuesday, February 22, 2005, at 6:30 p.m. in the third Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Building.

Chairman Williams called the meeting to order. Present in addition to Mr. Williams were Board members Mr. Klee, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Walker, Mr. Spence and Mr. Watson. None were absent. Also present was Zoning Administrator Murphy and Zoning Officer Beck.

CONSENT AGENDA

ARB #05-009 CWF/Colonial Williamsburg Spa/307 South England Street – Exterior Change (Doors, windows, canopies and ADA ramp) – Approved.

ARB #05-010 G-Square Inc/220 North Boundary Street – Exterior Change (Replace cedar shake shingles with architectural grade shingles and remove deck and replace with shed roof) – Approved.

ARB #05-011 CWF/Pink Cabana/411 West Duke of Gloucester Street – Exterior Change (New Color Scheme) – Approved.

ARB

SIGN#05-006 Casa Maya/1660 Richmond Road – Monument & Building Mounted Signs – Approved.

ARB

SIGN#05-008 Parlett's/421 Prince George Street – Building Mounted Sign – Approved.

Mr. Williams motioned to approve the consent agenda as presented.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Klee, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walker, Mr. Spence and Mr. Watson.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: Mr. Klee & Mr. Spence – ARB #05-009 & ARB #05-011.

CORRIDOR PROTECTION DISTRICT

ARB #05-006 Peppertree Condo Owners Association/1203-Z Jamestown Road – Exterior Change (Install vinyl siding over wood siding, trim and gutters)

Mike Putt and Bobby Bland represented the Peppertree Homeowners Association and presented their proposal to install vinyl siding over the existing wood siding. Mr. Putt noted the following:

- Vinyl siding was selected because of its low cost and maintenance and because it can be installed directly over the existing cedar siding.
- Vinyl siding would improve the looks of these buildings along Route 199. The Homeowners Association would install any color of vinyl siding deemed appropriate.
- Hardiplank siding, an acceptable alternative to wood would cost three times more than vinyl siding. This estimate includes the cost of removing the existing siding.
- Repairing and restaining the existing cedar siding would cost approximately \$120,000 - \$130,000.
- They have been staining the buildings every 4-5 years. Replacement vinyl siding would reduce maintenance requirements.
- Spray-on-Siding, a liquid product which when applied to a properly prepared surface comes with a lengthy guarantee, was investigated. The estimated cost is 3-4 times the cost of vinyl siding.
- Bristol Commons has vinyl siding-why can't they use vinyl siding also?

Mr. Bland stated that it is an undue hardship to not allow them to install vinyl siding on their building because other buildings around them have vinyl siding. He noted that vinyl siding had recently been installed on the McCardle building at the corner of Jamestown Road and Route 199. Mr. Bland also noted that repairing the existing siding would take dollars out of the owner's pockets by raising assessments with owners not being able to make the rents.

Mr. Williams asked Ms. Murphy to elaborate on her staff comments. Ms. Murphy stated the ***Design Review Guidelines*** state that vinyl siding is not an acceptable material in the **Corridor Protection District**. She also stated that CVS Pharmacy, Citizens and Farmers Bank and Geddy, Harris, Franck and Hickman Office Building are other projects in the area that have met the ***Design Review Guidelines***.

Mr. Williams stated the ***Design Review Guidelines*** are pretty straight forward in that vinyl siding is not an acceptable material in the **Corridor Protection District**. He noted the guidelines were established to maintain the unique character of Williamsburg and that this Board has applied the guidelines the same throughout areas that are covered by the ***Design Review Guidelines***.

Mr. Williams noted he visited the property to examine the cedar siding last year when the first request was submitted and noted the following:

- The buildings' appearance reveals neglect and a serious lack of maintenance illustrated by the deterioration of the existing cedar siding.
- If properly maintained over the years by the Homeowners Association this application would not be necessary.
- He purchased a new dwelling with similar cedar siding constructed in The Meadows Subdivision which was built at about the same time as the condo units. He visited the property to compare the condition of this siding with what he found on the condo buildings. The home's original cedar siding was still in excellent condition because it had been properly maintained by the property owners.

The other Board members concurred with Mr. Williams.

Mr. Hertzler stated the City of Williamsburg will be a more beautiful place to live in the future because of the **Design Review Guidelines** standards. He noted Bristol Commons is not located in an Architectural Preservation or Corridor Protection District.

Mr. Spence noted he drove by the McCardle Building and didn't realize that the siding had been replaced, that it didn't look that bad, but the Peppertree Condominiums did not look good at all. He said that he would vote in favor of upholding the **Design Review Guidelines**.

Mr. Bill Mettler, an absentee condo owner residing at 213 Sheffield Road, noted that the **Design Review Guideline** is unclear when it states that "aluminum siding, vinyl siding and sheeted siding are not acceptable materials" in the **Corridor Protection District**. He noted that the **Design Review Guideline** states "siding must be wood or a material, which is of a gauge and quality that resembles authentic horizontal wood siding; the latter may be acceptable if its form, detailing, painting, and overall appearance conveys the visual appearance of the authentic material" and that vinyl siding should be allowed.

Mr. Williams noted that the **Design Review Guidelines** are clear that aluminum siding, vinyl siding and sheeted sidings are not acceptable materials in the **Corridor Protection District**. He noted that the other reference was for synthetic siding such as Hardiplank or Cemiplank and was written to avoid referencing specific manufacturers of this particular type of siding.

Mr. Williams motioned to deny ARB #05-006 to cover the existing wood siding with vinyl siding because the request is not in accordance with the **Design Review Guidelines** which does not allow vinyl siding in the **Corridor Protection District**.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Klee, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walker, Mr. Spence and Mr. Watson.

Nay: None.

Absent: None.

Abstain: None.

ARB #05-007 Jamestown Commons Condominium Owners Association/101-Z Lake Powell Road – Exterior Change (Install vinyl siding over wood siding, trim and gutters)

Mr. Bill Mettler, 203 Sheffield Road, represented the Jamestown Commons Condominium Owners Association to install vinyl siding over the existing wood siding. He noted the following:

- This a 12-unit three building complex located behind the 7-11 at the corner of Jamestown Road and Route 199.
- He was a planner for over thirty years and Planning Director of the City of Williamsburg for eleven years.
- He disagreed with the Board's interpretation of "not an acceptable material" and thinks the board is being hard nosed by not allowing vinyl siding on these buildings. What difference does it make to the City of Williamsburg if these building are covered with vinyl siding?
- The cost to install Hardiplank siding would be much greater than vinyl siding.

Mr. Klee asked Mr. Mettler if he thought the principles of the **Design Review Guidelines** were flawed or if the Board should grant an exception for this one case.

Mr. Mettler stated that he did not agree with the placement of the boundary lines and that vinyl siding should be allowed in some instances.

Mr. Williams noted that Jamestown Road is one of the City's main entrance corridors. That it is important to keep the appearance up especially with the amount of visitors that will be traveling on Jamestown Road and Route 199 during the Jamestown 2007 Celebration. He reiterated that the **Design Review Guidelines** do not allow vinyl siding in the **Corridor Protection District**. He noted that the property owners must be responsible and maintain their properties. Allowing the owners to cover their deteriorated buildings with vinyl siding would be to reward them for years of neglect.

Mr. Kimber Smith noted that they stained the property every 4-5 years and that installing vinyl siding would reduce maintenance of the buildings by allowing them to be power washed.

Mr. Williams motioned to deny ARB #05-007 to cover the existing wood siding with vinyl siding because the request is not in accordance with the **Design Review Guidelines** which does not allow vinyl siding in the **Corridor Protection District**.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Klee, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walker, Mr. Spence and Mr. Watson.

Nay: None.

Absent: None.

Abstain: None.

ARB #05-008 McCardle & Nichols/1201 Jamestown Road – Retroactive approval to cover wood siding with vinyl siding

Larry McCardle presented his proposal for retroactive approval of vinyl siding over the Masonite siding on the McCardle Building at 1201 Jamestown Road. He read a statement to the Board giving the history of the building and how it was extensively damaged during Hurricane Isabel which led to the installation of vinyl siding. He stated that he did not know he needed approval from Architectural Review Board to reside the building with another material. He chose vinyl siding because it can be installed directly over the existing siding; Hardiplank or wood siding could not.

Mr. Klee asked Mr. McCardle if he thought the **Design Review Guidelines** were flawed; if the boundary lines that mark the districts were in the wrong place, if an exception should be granted for this application and if it would be appropriate for vinyl siding to be used on the Campus of William and Mary.

Mr. McCardle stated that the vinyl siding should be allowed anywhere in the City because people driving on the road would not be able to tell the difference between wood and vinyl siding, if William and Mary wants to install vinyl siding over top of their brick buildings it should be allowed and that the whole City should be in a Preservation District and not limited to certain areas. He noted that vinyl siding today doesn't peel; bow or flake if installed properly and is used in million dollar houses in Northern Virginia.

Mr. McCardle noted that vinyl siding is used in Ford's Colony and Settlers Mill and questioned if people even care about vinyl siding in the City or the entrance corridors.

Ms. Murphy stated state law does not allow the entire City to be located in an Architectural Preservation District.

Mr. Walker asked if an application for retroactive approval of work on the building had been submitted in the recent past. Mr. McCardle stated that last year he had submitted an application for the retroactive approval of shingles that had been applied without approval of the ARB. He said that the vinyl siding was installed around the same time, but he did not know the Architectural Review Board needed to approve the use of vinyl siding.

Mr. Klee noted that the town has decided that these particular parts of town are precious and that the **Design Review Guidelines** were established to protect these areas and to create an overall impression of the town. Visitors to the area can tell the

difference between areas that incorporate the ***Design Review Guidelines*** and those that don't.

Mr. Williams stated the Board is trying to preserve, protect and maintain the architectural character of the City through the ***Design Review Guidelines*** with the Board applying the guidelines in a fair manner.

Mr. McCardle noted that City Council needs to address this issue “before it gets out of hand”. He said that the guidelines should be enforced everywhere in the City.

Mr. Mettler noted you can change an area over a long period of time but you can't make changes in James City County.

Mr. Williams noted that other applicants have thanked the Board for changes made during the review process such as Williamsburg Chrysler Jeep Kia which is a credit to the City and a reflection of judicious guidelines.

Mr. Walker motioned to deny ARB #05-008 for retroactive approval to cover wood siding with vinyl siding because the ***Design Review Guidelines*** does not allow vinyl siding in the **Corridor Protection District**.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Klee, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walker, Mr. Spence and Mr. Watson.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: None.

ARB #05-012 Casa Maya/1660 Richmond Road – Exterior Change (New Color Scheme)

Samuel Gamez, lessee, presented an overview of the proposed color scheme noting the paint color for the roof (Benjamin Powell House Red), the brick (Daphine Room Beige) and the wood under the windows (Brafferton Blue).

The Board agreed that the colors were acceptable, but was concerned with the proposed signs not matching the building color scheme. Mr. Gamez stated that he would change the background on the signs from “Black Matte” to “Brafferton Blue” to coordinate the building and sign colors.

Mr. Williams motioned to approve ARB #05-012 conditioned upon an opaque “Brafferton Blue” background being used instead of “Matte Black” on the monument and building mounted signs.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Klee, Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walker, Mr. Spence and Mr. Watson.

Nay: None.

Absent: None.

Abstain: None.

SIGNS

ARB

SIGN#05-007 CWF/Pink Cabana/411 West Duke of Gloucester Street – Freestanding, Building and Awning Signage

Bruce Robertson presented the application to install a forest green and white striped awning with pink cabana in white lettering, a 12 square foot freestanding sign and an 8 square foot building mounted sign with a white background, Palmer House Green lettering with a moss pink cabana. He presented a color sample of “moss pink” to the Board. The Board agreed that the “moss pink” is an acceptable color.

Mr. Williams noted staff had a concern with the awnings not having side panels. Mr. Robbins explained that the existing awning is a retractable awning, and if it had side panels it would not be able to retract. He also noted that he is proposing to change the awning cover and not the existing framework. Mr. Williams stated that the Board could approve the awning without side panels because the existing framework is being used.

Mr. Williams motioned to approve ARB Sign #05-007 as presented.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Hertzler, Mr. Williams, Mr. Walker and Mr. Watson.

Nay: None.

Absent: None.

Abstain: Mr. Klee and Mr. Spence.

Minutes February 8, 2005

The minutes were approved as presented.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:05 P.M.

Jason Beck
Zoning Officer